



SAINT JOHN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE: Wednesday, November 10, 2010

TIME: 6:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Brunswick Square Storefront

PRESENT: Anne McShane
Sara Mudge
Shawn Peterson
David Drinnan
Ann Crozier
Andrew Miller
Derrick Mitchell
Mokhtaria Benhatchi
Councilor Patty Higgins

STAFF: Jacqueline Hamilton, Deputy Commissioner
Sarah Herring, Planner
Jody Kliffer, Planner
Ken Forrest, Commissioner

REGRETS: Jennifer Nicholls
Barry Harbinson
Gerry Lowe

1.0 Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:00pm

2.0 Approval of Agenda

Dave Drinnan moved that 2 items be added to the agenda: a communications strategy for individual CAC members and that staff be directed to provide greater input and direction to CAC. It was **MOVED** by Andrew Miller and **SECONDED** by Ann Crozier that the Agenda be adopted as amended.

CARRIED.

3.0 Adoption of Minutes

It was **MOVED** by Sara Mudge, **SECONDED** by Dave Drinnan to approve the minutes from November 3, 2010 as circulated.

CARRIED.

4.0 Review of Choices Public Feedback Summary

Jacqueline Hamilton provided a presentation reviewing the Options for Growth and Change, the underlying assumptions upon which they were formed (population projections, land budget, etc.), and the public feedback received during the October 14th public engagement event and the following 15 day comment period.

The public feedback discussed during the presentation and referenced in attachment 2: CAC memo was gathered from responses to the workbooks distributed at the event and at the Storefront, electronic versions of the workbook submitted through e-mail and Survey Monkey, and from written responses from individuals and stakeholder groups. In addition, feedback was received through a Developers and Landowners Focus Group and meetings with several other stakeholder groups during the weeks following the Choices engagement event.

The CAC requested that when references are made to comments from the "business community" that it be clarified whether the comment came from the business community at large or from the Board of Trade.

5.0 Review of Preferred Scenario

The presentation also provided an overview of the Preferred Scenario for Growth and Change and referenced the changes to the comments that were received from the public. For example, the public's strong support for Option 1 resulted in approximately 45% of development in the Preferred Option being targeted to Opportunity Areas in the urban core, and approximately 40% targeted to opportunity areas in the suburban area (changed from 50% urban in Option 1 and 60% suburban in Option 2). As well, changes were made to several Opportunity Areas in response to servicing and storm water concerns.

The CAC questioned whether our Municipal Plan could supersede Federal Port plans (in reference to the West Side port lands). Ms. Hamilton responded that while it would not, we intend the Plan to reflect the community's aspirations and development that would be in the interest of the greater community. By including these interests in our Plan we hope to encourage the Port (and other landowners such as the Airport) to reflect the wishes and good of the community in their own land use and strategic plans.

Dave Drinnan requested that where Port and Airport lands are identified on the Preferred Scenario maps that our policy position regarding their development be clearly identified. Mr. Forrest pointed out that it wasn't our intention to show these areas as Opportunity Areas, but rather to reflect their importance to existing and transportation systems.

Following the presentation, the CAC reviewed the Preferred Scenario in detail on maps of the Option. Staff elaborated on the rationale for each change made on the map and the group discussed requests from individual landowners.

Discussion then focussed on the following questions:

1. Do you support the preferred choice for growth and change?
2. What further changes would you suggest to address public feedback or other opportunities/challenges?
3. What suggestions would you make to the presentation of the preferred choice for growth?

The group supported the preferred choice for growth and change to be presented at the December 8th Open House, but asked that staff be prepared to explain the rationale behind the decisions (for example, why suburban opportunity areas were included when the public had voiced a preference for Option 1).

It was **MOVED** by Sara Mudge, **SECONDED** by Ann Crozier that the CAC endorse the preferred option for presentation to the public on December 8th.

The group suggested that the evolution of the preferred option be presented, and suggested that the maps be presented in layers. It was suggested that there be a "general question" station so that people know where/who they should be directing their questions. The CAC also pointed out that the presentation at the last Open House was too long, and that the focus of the presentation should be on new material rather than a review of where we've been.

Anne McShane and Dave Drinnan offered to help brainstorm key messages for the Open House, and Sara Mudge requested that materials be sent to the CAC as soon as possible so they would have time to read and properly digest the information. Staff agreed that materials would be sent a week ahead if at all possible so that the CAC could ask questions at the December 7th meeting.

6.0 Communication as Individual Members

The group discussed whether CAC members should be addressing PlanSJ issues as individuals, and if there were any guidelines that should be followed

in commenting as individuals. Dave Drinnan noted that he felt the CAC members should be more outspoken about engaging the public and they had been blogging about some of the issues recently raised.

Sara Mudge noted that she is also having a lot of conversations about PlanSJ and her personal thoughts, but that the group should be careful not to target any one group commenting on PlanSJ, especially in a negative way. She pointed out that we are encouraging and asking for comments from the public and that all comments, even criticism, should be accepted and respected.

The group agreed that everyone should express their opinions about PlanSJ issues as individuals, but that it should be pointed out when they are speaking as individuals and when they are representing the CAC. Everyone also agreed that divergent views among CAC members are fine as the CAC is made up of individuals with different perspectives and personal opinions.

The group suggested that it might be useful for staff to address issues/points of clarification in a Frequently Asked Questions format on the website or the PlanSJ Facebook page. Staff agreed, and asked members of the CAC to e-mail in comments and questions that they were hearing from the public.

7.0 Staff Perspectives and Inputs

Dave Drinnan asked that staff feel free to give the CAC more input and information on issues and situations that may not be common knowledge (for instance, legal authority for regional planning...). He pointed out that the CAC relies on staff for factual planning information and also for perspective from other cities. Mr. Forrest agreed and encouraged the CAC to contact staff if they receive any questions they feel unable to answer.

8.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting of the CAC is scheduled for December 7th at 6pm in the PlanSJ storefront and there will be a Holiday Party at the Hilton on December 15th.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.



Jacqueline Hamilton,
Deputy Commissioner of Planning & Development